

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are now ending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claims 1-4 stand objected to for certain informalities. By way of this Amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 1-4. Reconsideration of the present objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

By way of the present Amendment, Claims 1-4 have been amended that are believed to render the present rejection moot.

Additionally, Applicants submit that the terms "a rep mix" and "a plain weave L 1/1" do in fact have a clear meaning in the art. Specifically, Applicants submit that the

phrase "a rep mix" represents weaving a mixture or combination of a plain weave and a rep weave. The phrase "a plain weave L 1/1" is simply a plain weave. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sollars, Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,220,309). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants wish to note that Sollars merely teaches an all-woven inflatable fabric having two layers and attachment points where single layers of fabric are formed. These single fabric layers are constructed solely through the utilization of basket weave patterns to reduce air permeability and yarn shift. In other words, Sollars merely weaves a basket weave in the "single fabric layers" (Abstract). Sollars is completely silent with regard to weaving a combination weave other than a plain weave in either a two-ply portion or a multi-ply portion.

In contrast, the present invention is directed to a fabric that includes "weaving combination weaves other than a plain weave in at least one of said two-ply and multi-ply portions" (Claims 1-4). As described in the originally filed specification at [0003], implementing the present invention avoids wrinkles, especially in the two-ply and/or multi-ply portions, and achieves uniform crimp and shrinkage throughout the air bag. That is, the strength of the fabric is no longer reduced by trapped wrinkles. Additional advantages are further described in the originally filed specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Sollars fails to teach or suggest each and every

claim of the present application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: JANUARY 28, 2005

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JLS/smb

By: Jeffrey L. Snyder
Monte L. Falcoff, Reg. No. 37,617
Jeffrey L. Snyder, Reg. No. 43,141